Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/600,602	UEKI, JUN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David A. Lambertson	1636
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>David A. Lambertson</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mark Nuell</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 October 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
ii res, provide a brief description.		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Claim 27.		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
	4	·
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant)	'Applicant's Representative Sig	anature – if appropriate)
(Application	Apprount of Kopi Coolitative Oil	gnature – ir appropriate)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative was contacted to clarify the proper grammatical progression of claim 27. It was agreed that the word "one" was absent in the second line of the claim, between the terms "least" and "polynucleotide." Additionally, the term "Novel" was removed from the first line of the Abstract because it is presumed that a patented invention is "novel." These amendments are reflected in the attached Examiner's Amendment.